



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## BOOK REVIEWS

---

*Studien zur Geschichte des römischen Kolonates.* Von M. ROSTOWZEW.  
(Erstes Beiheft zum Archiv für Papyrusforschung.) Leipzig:  
Teubner, 1910. Pp. xii+432.

In Ptolemaic times the king was owner of all the land in Egypt. He disposed of it by giving it by auction in various forms of leasehold. Generally speaking it was of three kinds: garden lands, grain lands, and lands which through lack of water needed to be reclaimed for either of these uses. The bulk of the soil of Egypt belonged to the second of these groups, and to it the name γῆ βασιλική was given. Upon it lived the βασιλικοὶ γεωργοί. These leased their holdings from the king or subleased them from his tenants, the contract ("offer": ὑπόσχεσις) being revocable at the king's pleasure, but not at the will of the tenants. These could be dispossessed for failure to pay their taxes (ἐκφόρια), or when the king found anyone who would pay him higher taxes. Whether the land yielded them or not, the taxes had to be paid. The only course open to the tenants when their situation became intolerable was to "strike," that is to say, leave their villages in a body and scatter about in other villages. They were under the jurisdiction of the administrative and not of the judicial officers.

The management of these lands presented relatively few difficulties to the Ptolemies and to the Romans, their successors. Under the latter the tenants appear as δημόσιοι γεωργοί or βασιλικοὶ γεωργοί, the difference being one of the status of the land on which they lived (*ager publicus* vs. *patrimonium principis*). Their condition became worse rather than better with the change of masters; for the Romans made the strike ineffective by abolishing the right of sanctuary, and by constantly driving refugees out of Alexandria, whither they tended to flee. The greatest hardship of the γεωργοί arose in both epochs through the constraint put upon them by the officials to till, in addition to the land of their own village, portions of the *ager rudis* or *derelictus* in their vicinity. They formed usually a village community with elders (πρεσβύτεροι) at their head; but since these were appointed by the officials their benefit to the peasants was problematical. The only effective way of escape open to the latter from official oppression was for them to put themselves either as individuals or as villages under the patronage of the *potentes*, or great landed proprietors. The formation of this class is the most striking phenomenon in the agrarian history of Egypt between the fourth and the sixth century A.D., as has been shown by Zulueta

(*De patrociniis vicorum*, Vinogradoff's "Oxford Studies in Social and Legal History" 1, 2) and by Gelzer (*Studien zur byzantinischen Verwaltung Aegyptens*, "Leipziger historische Abhandlungen" XIII), to whom Rostowzew refers.

The Ptolemies gave part of their arable land ( $\gamma\eta\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\epsilon\tau\eta$ ) for the use of the priests ( $\gamma\eta\ \iota\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}$ ). These grants the Romans revoked, but the lands thus confiscated they relet to the priests, who subsequently either tilled them themselves on much the same terms as the  $\delta\eta\mu\acute{o}\sigma\iota\omicron\iota\ \gamma\epsilon\omega\rho\gamma\acute{o}\iota$ , or sublet them to  $\delta\eta\mu\acute{o}\sigma\iota\omicron\iota\ \gamma\epsilon\omega\rho\gamma\acute{o}\iota$ , contenting themselves with the small gain made on the transaction. Their tenure was, generally speaking, less precarious than that of the ordinary tenants of the state, but not essentially different.

Three serious difficulties both the Ptolemies and the Romans had to encounter in Egypt: (1) to bring under cultivation areas not regularly watered and fertilized by the annual overflow of the Nile, (2) to get something tangible by means of which to hold the vast army of officials—whose public services were always *liturgical* in character—to their contracts or their obligations, and (3) to strengthen the foreign element or interest in the country. The only way they found of solving these difficulties was to abandon the precarious tenure maintained by them in the case of the old grain lands ( $\gamma\eta\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\epsilon\tau\eta$ ). The Ptolemies accordingly gave considerable tracts to their friends, the so-called  $\gamma\eta\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \delta\omega\rho\epsilon\acute{\alpha}$ , not as freehold, but in *Erbpacht* and with the important privilege of exemption from  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\phi\acute{o}\rho\iota\alpha$ . These estates were confiscated at the time of the Roman occupation, but were given anew by the early *principes* to members of their families, Roman senators, or favorites of Roman, Greek, or Egyptian nationality. Thus arose the  $\omicron\upsilon\sigma\acute{\alpha}\iota$ , which were confiscated again and made into royal lands by the Claudian emperors and constituted by Vespasian as a special category, this great agrarian organizer having established the  $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma\ \omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$  for their management. (The  $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma\ \delta\iota\omicron\iota\kappa\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma$  cared for the  $\gamma\eta\ \beta\alpha\sigma.$  and  $\delta\eta\mu.$ , the  $\gamma\eta\ \iota\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}$ , and the  $\gamma\eta\ \acute{\epsilon}\xi\ \acute{\alpha}\xi\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ .) This  $\gamma\eta\ \omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha\kappa\acute{\eta}$  was given to contractors on *zeitlich begrenzte Mithoseis*. The  $\mu\omicron\sigma\theta\omega\tau\acute{\alpha}\iota$ , however, usually sublet it to  $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron\mu\omicron\sigma\theta\omega\tau\acute{\alpha}\iota$  on terms regulated by the state. The rents were paid to the state directly, so that the  $\mu\omicron\sigma\theta\omega\tau\acute{\alpha}\iota$  did little more than go as sureties for their payment. The tendency was for the leases to become indefinite and obligatory. Much of this land was reclaimed land which needed constant watchfulness to be kept fertile.

The regular method of dealing with the *ager rudis* in Ptolemaic times was to give it for an initial sum (payable in three or four instalments) and with *ateleia* for five years followed by *kuphoteleia* for three further years, in a form of hereditary leasehold, which was substantially private ownership, to men ordinarily Macedonians, Greeks, Jews, and Levantines who came to Egypt with some capital after the foreign occupation. The land thus held was termed  $\gamma\eta\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\phi\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\epsilon\iota$ , and it was held by *kleruchi*, *katoekì*, and

others. Their lots were their private *κτήματα*, as were the houses and gardens or orchards generally in Egypt. From this class came the government officials whose services were thus insured by the private property they were bound to sacrifice in case of neglect, inefficiency, or dishonesty. The Romans confiscated much of the *γῆ ἐν ἀρετῇ* of the Macedonian *kleruchs* and *katoeki* and added such of it as was under grain cultivation to the *ager publicus*, but sold the rest, together with ordinary *ager rudis*—the so-called *γῆ ἐξ ἀξίας*, for what could be got for it, as *γῆ κληρουχική, κατοικική, and ιδιόκτητος* respectively. Thus arose in the first century A.D. *eine gewaltige Armee von meistens kleinen Grundbesitzern*. The position of these property holders was anything but an enviable one in the third century A.D. They seem to have been usually in arrears to the government (p. 140). On the foreclosure of the mortgage the land became *γῆ προσόδου*, and paid a new tax as interest on the debt—sureties (*ἐπιτηρηταί*) being demanded, perhaps from the owners. After a time, on failure to pay the sum due, the land was sold and passed into whatever category it had belonged in before becoming *γῆ προσόδου*. The position of the landowners was made still worse when the Severi introduced the municipal system into Egypt; for this had as its net result to place the responsibility for the payment of the *ἐκφόρια* and the polltax and all the other burdens of the *δημόσιοι γεωργοί* upon the shoulders of the proprietors. Henceforth they had to be held to their *ιδία* or *origo*, just like the *γεωργοί* (who are the *dediticii* of Caracalla's edict); and, in fact, their status did not differ essentially from that of the ordinary tenants. To them too the patronage of the *potentes* was the only escape from an intolerable position. Hence the feudalization of Egypt between the fourth and the sixth centuries A.D.

The above is an abstract of the first half of Rostowzew's work. As can be readily seen, two things are attempted in it: to define the technical terms for land tenure used in the papyri (on p. 220 ff. is a beautiful elucidation of the curious term *homologi* [it equals *dediticii*] contributed by Wilcken, who has given most generous aid to the author in this part of his book), and to sketch the agrarian history of Egypt from the Ptolemaic occupation to the third century A.D. The same dual tendency is observable in the second half, where Sicily, Asia Minor, and Africa are treated in succession (the inscriptions being, however, a poor substitute for the papyri); and in addition the effort is there made to trace and estimate the influence upon Rome of the Hellenistic methods of dealing with the public domain. In this portion the sections devoted to Asia Minor are particularly instructive. Nowhere else can one find so good an orientation on the agrarian problems and policies of the Seleucids. We see them breaking down the power of the noble or priestly families to whom the most of the interior of the peninsula belonged at Alexander's conquest by founding new cities, disposing of portions of the public land—*λαοί* and all—to old and new urban centers, and substituting themselves as overlords in place of the nobles and

priests. The Roman senators in the first century B.C., through acquiring by gift or purchase vast estates in Asia Minor, threatened to feudalize this region once more, but the confiscatory policy of the Claudian emperors checked this tendency, and from the time of Vespasian to Hadrian the attempt was made here, as in Africa, to create on the public domains a class of *λαιοί* whose first loyalty would be given to their feudal lord—the emperor himself. A whole series of general enactments was issued (e.g., the *lex Manciana* and the *lex Hadriana de agris rudibus* in Africa) to effect this purpose, the net result being, however, to substitute, in the third century A.D. and thereafter, for a senator of the old style an imperial official as feudal lord between the *λαιοί* and the emperor.

Rostowzew's *Studien zur Geschichte des römischen Kolonates* is one of the most illuminating works on ancient history which has appeared in recent years. It is bound to be fundamental for all future studies on the economic history of Hellenistic and Roman times. The *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* is to be congratulated on the character, if not on the style, of its first *Beiheft*.

WILLIAM SCOTT FERGUSON

---

*Syntax of Classical Greek from Homer to Demosthenes.* Second Part, "The Syntax of the Simple Sentence Continued, Embracing the Doctrine of the Article." By BASIL LANNAU GILDERSLEEVE with the co-operation of CHARLES WILLIAM EMIL MILLER. —The Doctrine of the Article Elaborated, by PROFESSOR MILLER.—New York: American Book Co., 1911.

In reviewing this volume it is assumed that the reader is familiar with the first part and the remarks made in the preface of that volume concerning the arrangement adopted which the author himself hints may not be the best; "but to refashion the book," says he, "would require more time than the speeding years will allow me to presume on." From the preface of this second part we learn that Professor Miller, who aided also in the preparation of Part I, rendered still greater service. Then we read: "The disparateness of the two parts was inevitable under the circumstances, and the delay occasioned by the co-operation has been so great that it has seemed best at this point to dissolve the partnership, maintained for so many years, as it would have been dissolved at any rate in the natural course of things. An outline of what remains is in progress, and though it is high time that I cut down long hope to match the brief space of human life, I do not hesitate to commit myself to a plan that involves little more than the shaping of material already in hand."

To review a work of Gildersleeve, a scholar whose utterance is law, can be little more than simply to state its contents. The first part (which appeared ten years ago) is devoted to the simple sentence. The second